

REMARKS

Claims 9–32 are pending and were rejected. Claims 9, 18, 24, 30, and 31 are amended. Claims 12, 14, and 21–22 are cancelled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under § 112

Claims 30–32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. Specifically, various antecedent basis issues were raised by the Examiner. Claims 30 and 31 have been amended to correct the issues identified. With respect to claim 32, antecedent basis for the term “said second memory device” appears in claim 28, line 13, *i.e.*, “said output memory including a second memory device.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is therefore requested.

Rejections Under § 102

Claims 9–32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,926,120 to Swenson et al. (“Swenson”). The following remarks are drawn to the independent claims, *i.e.*, claims 9, 18, 24, and 28. Because these claims each include limitations not found in Swenson, they are allowable over Swenson. The claims depending therefrom are, therefore, necessarily allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 is drawn to a method of performing serial-to-parallel conversion, and requires, among other things, the use of a dual port memory. This may be seen with reference to Fig. 3 and the accompanying description, in which the serial to parallel mapping circuit 44 interacts with one port of the dual port memory 46 while the output mapping circuit 92 interacts with the second port of the dual port memory 46. Claim 9 has been amended to clearly recite the requirement of a dual port memory.

Swenson does not disclose a dual port memory. Specifically, it can be seen that the memory 80 of Swenson has only address select line. The bit select input 85 used for multiplexers 81 and 82 cannot be the second address select line necessarily required by a dual port memory for at least two reasons. First, the multiplexers 81 and 82 are not part of the memory 80. Second, the bit select only acts to select a particular bit from a nibble being read out

from the address specified by address select line 79. Because Swenson does not include the required dual port memory, rejection of claim 9, and claims 10–17 depending therefrom as anticipated by Swenson is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is therefore requested.

Claim 18 is drawn to a method of parallel-to-serial conversion. As with claim 9, claim 18 has been amended to more clearly recite the requirement that the parallel-to-serial conversion be performed using a dual port memory. As noted above, Swenson does not include the required dual port memory. Therefore, the rejection of claim 18 and claims 19–23 depending therefrom as anticipated by Swenson is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18–23 is therefore requested.

Claim 24 is drawn to a method of serial-to-parallel data conversion. As with claims 9 and 18, claim 24 has been amended to more clearly recite the requirement of a dual port memory. Because Swenson does not include the required dual port memory, the rejection of claims 24 and claims 25–27 depending therefrom as anticipated by Swenson is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24–27 is therefore requested.

Claim 28 as originally presented inherently requires a dual port memory. Specifically, claim 28 requires “input memory including a first memory device having a two memory banks, which two memory banks allow writing of data to a first of said two memory banks simultaneous with reading of data from a second of said two memory banks.” The memory 80 of Swenson cannot meet this limitation because there is only one address select line 79. Thus only one address can be accessed at any one time, which necessarily prevents reading and writing simultaneously. The rejection of claim 28 and claims 29–32 depending therefrom as anticipated by Swenson is therefore improper. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28–32 is therefore requested.

Serial No. 10/612,863

Amendment dated October 25, 2006

in Response to Office Action dated June 29, 2006

Conclusion

Because each of the pending claims include at least one limitation not disclosed in the cited reference of record, rejection of these claims is improper. A notice of allowance for all pending claims is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 25, 2006

Date

/Billy C. Allen III/

Billy C. Allen III

Reg. No. 46,147

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
832-446-2409
832-446-2424 (facsimile)

Electronic submission